UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,870	08/06/2003	Takayuki Yagi	03560.002432.1	7625
	7590 01/16/200 CELLA HARPER &	EXAMINER		
30 ROCKEFEL	LER PLAZA	VARGOT, MATHIEU D		
NEW YORK, NY 10112			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		1791		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/634,870	YAGI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Matilied D. Vargot	1/91	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra time of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount chortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month:	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	ΓE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	er form for appeal by materially rec	ducing or simplifying the	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	acted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orresponding number of finally reje	cied ciaims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1 See attached Notice of Non-Co.	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		inpliant Amendment (1 1 OL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all.		imaly filed amondmor	ot cancoling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subiliitted iii a separate, i	illiely filed afficildifier	it cancelling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	l Not I ii ii ii ii	1141 - 11	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		i condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	r i O/Sb/06) Paper NO(S)		
	/Mathieu D. Vargot/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791	
	,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is maintained that the determination of an acceptable diameter for the electroplating would have been within the skill level of the art and would call for no more than routine experimentation on the part of one of skill in the art. The fact that the prior art does not teach varying the diameter is not necessarily probative in this regard. First of all, the prior art applied is in the Japanese language and translations thereof would have to be obtained to determine any disclosure of diameter size. Also, the diameter would necessarily be dependent on the size of microlens desired and as such, does not have to be disclosed as a result effective variable. One of ordinary skill in the art would understand it to be one. Applicant has merely found a certain range over which the mold is most expeditiously made. That does not mean that the mold cannot be made should the diameter of the hole stray outside this range. Certainly, the value for the diameter can be as small as desired. Apparently, it is only when the diameter exceeds a certain value with respect to the radius of curvature of the resultant lens that the mold cannot be formed. While applicant calls this a critical value, it is submitted that such would have been readily determined through routine experimentation. Also, the very act of electroplating would allow the desired radius to pass through a minimum before the desired value is reached.